



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

a question of which is the superior race or which has the better culture. The objection to the Japanese is that with their coming Anglo-Saxon culture came

in direct conflict with a Mongolian one. They can not live side by side and neither will give way to the other without a conflict.

Japanese in California

A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF (1) REPORT OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF CONTROL; (2) LETTER BY GOVERNOR STEPHENS TO SECRETARY COLBY; (3) HEARINGS IN CALIFORNIA BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

By SIDNEY L. GULICK, D.D.¹

Secretary, National Committee for Constructive Immigration Legislation, New York City

THE California State Board of Control at the request of Governor Stephens made a special investigation of the Japanese in California. Its report (of 225 pages) was issued June 19, 1920. The Governor conveyed it to the Secretary of State, Honorable Bainbridge Colby, with a covering letter of the same date. This letter forms the introduction to the volume containing the report.

The House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization held Hearings in California on the Japanese question, beginning in San Francisco July 12, continuing in other California cities, and concluding in the state of Washington. No official report of these Hearings has been published. They were, however, public meetings. Mr. R. W. Ryder has furnished the writer with an abstract and résumé of the proceedings covering 104 pages, parts of the testimony being given verbatim.

¹ Also Secretary, Commission on Relations with the Orient of Federal Council Churches of Christ in America since 1914. Author of: *Evolution of the Japanese, Social and Psychic* (1903), *The White Peril in the Far East* (1905), *The American-Japanese Problem* (1914), *Working Women of Japan* (1915), *America and the Orient* (1916), *Anti-Japanese War-Scare Stories* (1917), *American Democracy and Asiatic Citizenship* (1918).—The Editor.

The report of the Board of Control, the Governor's letter and the Hearings played a significant rôle in the California vote on the referendum Land Law. They will long be regarded as authoritative statements of the situation. An impartial and critical examination of their real character and value is desirable.

SOME SURPRISES

"The Japanese in Los Angeles are well housed and my reports say that they respond quickly to orders or suggestions from the authorities as to improvements or changes in their houses. Indeed, they are often more satisfactory in this regard than the lower class of Americans."

"One very noticeable feature in a Japanese labor camp where both American and Japanese laborers are employed is that the quarters provided for Japanese are generally better than those provided for the Americans. . . . Our experience with Japanese labor camp operators is that they will make any improvements necessary."

These two quotations are taken from the official reports to the Board of Con-

trol, the first by Mrs. A. S. Calhoun, District Representative of the State Commission on Immigration and Housing, and the second by Mr. Edward A. Brown, Chief Sanitary Engineer, of the State Commission on Immigration and Housing.

GENERAL CHARACTER OF THE REPORT

The foregoing quotations show that the report seeks to be perfectly fair. Facts favorable to the Japanese are found in many sections of the report.

Governor Stephen's letter of instruction to the State Board of Control stated that the purpose of the report was not merely to provide the California State Legislature with "reliable information" and "authenticated facts," but that this report would also be presented to the Congress of the United States with a view to securing from Congress the remedial legislation needed.

The State Board of Control in submitting its report stated that since its "instructions call for facts only, this Board has not drawn any conclusions or suggested any remedies."

A rather careful reading of the report has impressed the writer of this paper with the fact that the Board has succeeded remarkably well in presenting the bare objective facts and in excluding opinions, assertions and adjectives showing prejudice or ill-will. A sharp eye can indeed detect an occasional slip, a bit of special pleading and an effort to create an opinion, but they are remarkably rare for a document prepared in California during the stress of a heated campaign, with a view to securing legislation circumscribing very narrowly the privileges of the Japanese.

THE HIATUS BETWEEN THE REPORT AND THE GOVERNOR'S LETTER

Probably the most amazing feature

of the volume is the non-sequitur between the facts given in the report and the argument made by Governor Stephens.

The report deals with questions of population, of land ownership and leases, the financing of Japanese enterprises, the fishing industry, labor, corporations, "picture brides," the "Gentlemen's Agreement," smuggling, citizenship and schools. Nowhere does it consider such other important questions as the Japanese crime record, alleged prostitution, gambling, illiteracy, knowledge of English, assimilability, Americanization and intermarriage.

The Governor devotes less than a page of his letter to the material presented in the report. He brushes aside the economic consideration as comparatively irrelevant, and focuses his full force on the alleged "non-assimilability" of the Japanese. According to his statement, the ground of objection to the Japanese is hardly if at all due to their economic competition, as Senator Phelan, State Senator Inman and others have insisted, but is due absolutely and unqualifiedly to race difference.

The change of atmosphere between the cool statement of fact in the report and the impassioned assertion of race feeling in the letter is impressive. Indeed, this letter is so different from the documents and papers that we are accustomed to see from the hand of the Governor, that one is forced to wonder whether the letter was in fact written by him. Was it not prepared by someone in his staff—for instance, by Mr. Marshall De Motte, Chairman of the State Board of Control, or Mr. John S. Chambers, State Controller and also Chairman of the "Japanese Exclusion League of California?"

THE GOVERNOR'S CHIEF CONTENTION

Governor Stephens, in a gracious paragraph, makes "full recognition of the many admirable qualities of the Japanese people. We assume no arrogant superiority of race or culture over them. . . . We join with the entire civilized world in our admiration of the tremendous strides which the Japanese nation has made in the last two generations, unparalleled as its career is in the history of nations."

But he goes on to say: "This problem of ours is not an insignificant one. . . . It has nothing to do with any pretensions of race superiority, but has vitally to do with race dissimilarity and unassimilability. . . . The people of California are determined to repress a developing Japanese community within our midst. . . . This determination is based fundamentally on the ethnological impossibility of assimilating the Japanese people. . . . We can not feel contented at our children imbibing their first rudiments of education from the lips of the public school teacher in classrooms crowded with other children of a different race. They do not and will not associate in that relationship prevalent elsewhere in the public schools of this country. We recognize that this attitude is too deep-seated to remove. And we recognize that with this attitude goes the necessity of Japanese isolation and that inevitable feeling which socially a prescribed race always feels."

Several pages are devoted to reiterations of this theme. The language is emphatic and the position well defined, though no attempt is made to state just what assimilation is. He implies that it could take place only by intermarriage, "blood fusion" which, however, is "impossible." He closes with the affirmation that the action of California is "based entirely on the princi-

ple of self-preservation and the ethnological impossibility of successfully assimilating this constantly increasing flow of Oriental blood."

THE GOVERNOR'S PROGRAM

After reviewing the recent history of California's legislation and her delay in passing a law in 1919, due to the request of President Wilson because of certain international relations, Governor Stephens refers to the "initiative measure" forbidding to Japanese land ownership and the leasing of land, which land law he says "can not legally prevent Japanese control of our soil nor can it stop further immigration." These are matters that only action by the Federal Government can secure. He therefore appeals to the Secretary of State "to use his good offices with the Empire of Japan that stricter provisions be immediately agreed upon, making impossible any further evasion or violation of the spirit of the present arrangement."

He also says that "the full solution of this question can not be had short of an exclusion act passed by Congress. It is my purpose . . . to communicate the information to our various Representatives and Senators in Congress that they may then be equipped to take up the cause of California and urge the passage of an exclusion act effectively disposing of this difficulty." The Governor defines somewhat in detail the kind of law which in his opinion is needed. It amounts virtually to the application to Japanese of the laws which we now have for dealing with the Chinese.

In view of these statements we know what to expect. Whatever revamping of the "Gentlemen's Agreement" the Department of State may secure from Japan, the policy proposed by the Governor is to enact as soon as possible a stringent exclusion act to take

its place. That exclusion act may be identical with the Chinese exclusion act, or it may be the adoption of the proposal by Senator Phelan to include Japan in the "geographical zone" from which zone by the present law all non-Caucasian immigrants are excluded.

The effect on Japan of either plan can be forecast without particular difficulty.

THE GOVERNOR'S FUNDAMENTAL POSTULATES

The fundamental postulates of the Governor's position are (1) that Japanese are absolutely unassimilable, (2) that the Japanese Government has been "violating" the "Gentlemen's Agreement" and (3) that if his proposals for the rigid stoppage of Japanese immigration are adopted there will be no increase of the Japanese population in California and the perennial American-Japanese problem will be solved.

What light do the Report and the Hearings throw on these assumptions? Are they well founded?

ARE JAPANESE NON-ASSIMILABLE?

The report does not discuss the question. This would seem to be a serious failure, for it is the most important issue in the whole problem. What constitutes assimilation in the case of Italians for instance or Jews, or Poles and Russians? How long does it take? Do foreigners become loyal Americans only by intermarriage?

If Europeans can become loyal Americans by education, if they become enthusiastic supporters of our ideas and ideals of life and democracy and coöperate with us in making our democracy a real success, then may not Japanese do likewise? What are the facts? This is a matter for objective investigation.

EXPERT TESTIMONY

"I have found no trouble in the mixing of Japanese and Americans in the various social functions of eight public schools." This sworn testimony was made to the House Committee on Immigration in Stockton July 16, 1920, by Mrs. J. S. Woodruff. For two years she has been employed by the State as Americanization teacher, working mostly among the Japanese. She also declared "that her work took her into the Japanese homes and that she had found the Japanese to be honest, loyal, industrious and public spirited. . . . She believed that there could be full social and intellectual assimilation of the Japanese."

"The Japanese children are bright, studious and easily disciplined. . . . I know of no trouble on account of Japanese and Americans attending the same schools. . . . The Japanese high school students are particularly good students." This was the sworn testimony of Mr. John Anderson, Superintendent of Schools for San Joaquin County. He stated that in the county schools there were 12,016 male and 10,574 female pupils, of whom 616 and 453 respectively were Orientals.

Mr. C. B. Hart testified under oath that "he had sold goods to the Japanese to the extent of \$200,000 per year, and had found them to be trustworthy and thoroughly satisfactory patrons. He had given them credit and his experience with them had been decidedly pleasant."

Mr. M. Kumora, a Japanese, testified under oath that "he had thirty Japanese Boy Scouts under his direction. . . . It was his highest desire to become a good and useful American citizen."

Mr. George Shima, the so-called "Potato King" gave sworn testimony

to the effect that he and his family had long been members of the Methodist Episcopal Church and "that the one thing he most desired was to become an American citizen." In response to questions he stated that "he had purchased one hundred and eighty thousand dollars' worth of Liberty Bonds, had given liberally to the Red Cross and other war charities and had recently donated the sum of forty thousand dollars toward a fund to erect at Stockton, California, a memorial to those sons of San Joaquin County who gave their lives in the late war."

The Hearings of the House Committee on Immigration contains a large amount of testimony of the kind quoted above. Of course it also contains the customary assertions of absolute non-assimilability, by such witnesses as Senator Phelan, Mr. McClatchy and others. Quotations need hardly be made since their assertions have been given wide circulation. Manifestly the question is not quite so simple and the opinions are not quite so unanimous as the Governor's letter assumes.

THE ALLEGED VIOLATION OF THE "GENTLEMEN'S AGREEMENT"

The report devotes ten pages to its exceedingly valuable statement in regard to the "Gentlemen's Agreement." In this section it fails somewhat in maintaining its fine attitude of cool and clear objectivity. It begins indeed by exonerating Japan and by saying that "the real ground for complaint" is with American diplomacy that made the agreement and with the Bureau of Immigration, in failing to see that it is faithfully administered.

The report (p. 163) points out that the right "to join a wife" in America as provided in the agreement has been misinterpreted as equivalent to the

right of a Japanese wife in Japan "to join a husband" in America. This argument is unconvincing; for the first printed statement of that agreement contains the words, "so that the three classes of laborers entitled to receive passports became known as 'former residents,' 'parents, wives or children of residents,' and 'settled agriculturalists.'"

The report (p. 164) brings out the fact that in 1915 (according to Professor Ichihashi) there were 20,000 "farm hands" and then asks, "How do these laborers get here?" The unsuspecting reader will infer that they get here by some evasion of the agreement, whereas the fact is that they were already here when the agreement went into operation.

Statistics are presented (p. 169) giving the "Excess of Immigrant Aliens Admitted over Emigrant Aliens Departed, July 1, 1909 to June 30, 1919." These figures show that the total number entering Continental United States was 36,989, of whom 23,708 or 64.1 per cent settled in California. A reader not expert in immigration statistics will assume that in spite of the agreement a very considerable immigration to California has been going on. A full statement of the statistics does not warrant the assumption.

The expert well knows that the technical distinction between "immigrant" and "non-immigrant," "emigrant" and "non-emigrant" has little if any practical value. To get at the real situation we must deal with all arrivals and all departures. When we do this we find that for the ten years under discussion (July 1, 1909 to June 30, 1919) the total excess is 10,968 instead of the 36,989 given in the table. If 64.1 per cent settled in California (as the report states) the increase of Japanese population in

California by excess of arrivals over departures was 7,030 instead of 23,708 as claimed by the State Board of Control.

This error in the calculations of the California State Board of Control is so significant that the difference may well be given in tabular form.

Increase of Japanese population in California by excess of "immigration" over "emigration"	23,708
Actual increase by excess of "all admittances" over "all departures"	7,030

Over calculation of increase by the Board	16,678
-----------------------------------------------------	--------

These 16,678 are regarded as still resident in California although as a matter of fact they have left the country.

But it may be asked if even this amount (7,030) of immigration is not evidence of violation of the agreement. The reply is to be found by analyzing what kind of individuals are included in this figure (7,030). Analysis of all arrivals shows that during the ten years covered by the table the number of Japanese admitted to Continental United States as "wives" was 24,298 and as "children" 10,417. If 64.1 per cent settled in California the figures for each group are 15,575 and 6,677 respectively. Their sum is 22,252. If now we assume that all the "wives" and "children" who entered California during the ten years have remained there (none going to Washington, Oregon or to any other state), since the total increase of Japanese population in the state was 7,030, we shall have to assume that 15,222 Japanese who were in California July 1, 1909 departed during the subsequent ten years.

A careful study of the facts, therefore, does not seem to substantiate the Governor's view or the implication of the report that there has been any serious violation of the agreement.

THE ALLEGED ADMISSION OF LABORERS WITHOUT PROPER PASSPORTS

The report calls attention to the admission of 825 laborers without proper passports and to 585 other persons who had passports but were "not entitled" to them. If these are indeed the facts, then the Bureau of Immigration has failed to do its duty. Such failure can not be charged to the Japanese Government. Careful examination of the annual reports and of the usages of the Bureau of Immigration makes it clear that those admitted "without proper passports" are admitted under bond to go through America to the countries to which their passports admit them.

JAPANESE POPULATION IN CALIFORNIA

The report seeks to determine the Japanese population of California. It begins with the Japanese population according to the United States Census of 1910. It then adds the "immigrants" and births, and subtracts the "emigrants" and deaths, reaching the conclusion that the Japanese population in California December 31, 1919 is 87,279. But it states on the following page (p. 27) that of these, 5,000 children are in Japan "for the purpose of completing their education."

In order to get an independent estimate, the Board asked the Japanese Association of America to take a special census of its own. The result (given on p. 165) shows that there were in California 78,628 Japanese, of whom 15,539 are stated to be women and 18,191 to be children (under 17 years of age). A discrepancy of 3,651 thus appears between the Board's estimate and that of the Japanese.

If the Board's figures are correct then the Japanese population in California has increased by "immigration" over "emigration" to the extent of 25,592; and if this is the case, since the

total increase for the whole country is calculated by the Board to be only 14,719 (p. 30) it follows that the Japanese population in the rest of the country has diminished by 10,873.

The report has, however, fallen unwittingly into serious confusion and error. To the figures (p. 29) of the Census of 1910 for the Japanese population in Continental United States (72,157), excluding Hawaii, it has added the "immigration" into the whole of the United States (including Hawaii) from April 15, 1910 to June 30, 1919 and to this it then adds arrivals in San Francisco only for six months more, giving a total of 150,540 and it then subtracts a similarly confused sum of "emigrants" from the United States (including Hawaii) and from San Francisco for six months, which is given as 63,664. This figure, however, is clearly erroneous, the total "emigration" for the period being only 14,548. It concludes that the Japanese population in Continental United States has increased through excess of "immigration" over "emigration" by 14,719 (p. 30). This confusion causes the result to have no meaning whatever.

The facts are these for United States (including Hawaii):

1. Total "immigration" April 1, 1910 to Dec. 31, 1919.....	80,186
Total "emigration" April 1, 1910 to Dec. 31, 1919.....	<u>14,548</u>
Increase by excess of "immigra- tion" over "emigration".....	<u>65,638</u>
2. Total Japanese admitted April 1, 1910 to Dec. 31, 1919.....	116,627
Total Departed April 1, 1910 to Dec. 31, 1919.....	<u>90,342</u>
Increase by excess of admittances.	<u>26,285</u>

That is to say, when we deal only with "immigrants" and "emigrants" we conclude that Japanese in America (including Hawaii) have increased by 65,638, whereas if we deal with all

admitted and all departed we find that the actual increase is only 26,285. The former method, which is the one used by the California State Board of Control, would require us to assume that 39,353 Japanese are still in the country who have in fact departed.

Instead of the population of the rest of the states having diminished by 10,873 as the Board infers (p. 30), the Japanese population in those states has increased by 14,408, if we deal only with the misleading figures of "immigration" and "emigration." The Annual Reports of the Commissioner General of Immigration do not permit us to estimate accurately the Japanese population in each state.

It is open to question, however, whether even the Japanese "Census" is really accurate. We do not know whether that census was an actual count or consisted largely of local estimates. The writer calculates the Japanese population in California, December 31, 1919, to be 72,518. This figure is secured as follows:

Excess of Admittances over Departures from Continental United States April 1, 1910-December 31, 1919.....	16,898 ¹
Proportion who went to California (64.1 per cent).....	10,831
(see State Board Report, p. 169)	
Increase by Births over Deaths....	20,331
(see State Board Report, p. 25)	
Japanese Population in California Census 1910.....	<u>41,356</u>
Japanese Population in California December 31, 1919.....	72,518

If it be true that 5,000 of the Japanese children have returned to Japan for study, then the Japanese population in California should be about 68,518,

¹This figure is secured by adding to the sum of the figures given in the Annual Reports of the Commissioner General of Immigration for the years 1911-1919 one-quarter of the figure for the year 1910 plus one-half of the figure for 1919, namely 15,966 - 606 + 1,538.

which is 10,110 less than the Japanese estimate, and 13,761 less than the estimate of the Board.

The Census Bureau reports (November 17, 1920) the Japanese population in California to be 70,196, which adds confusion to the already confused situation. If the Census of 1910, the records of the Bureau of Immigration as to arrivals and departures of alien Japanese and the California State Records as to births and deaths are correct, and if the ratio of those who go to California (64.1 per cent) is correctly estimated by the Board and if 5,000 Japanese children have been sent back to Japan for study, then the Japanese population of California ought to be approximately 68,518.

When the census was taken in January, 1920, charges were made that Japanese in some places avoided being recorded. This may be true. The Census of 1910 may also not have been correct. Statistics published by Japanese in 1912 claimed a Japanese population in California of 54,980. The birth and death records of Japanese in California are in all probability not complete. The estimate of 5,000 children returned to Japan appears to be a vague guess rather than an estimate based on figures.

The net result of this investigation is that the facts are far from clear. We shall probably be fairly safe if we regard the Japanese population in California as somewhere between 70,000 and 80,000. The recent census figures are so important that they are added as an appendix.

In order that the true state of the case in regard to Japanese population in California may be kept clear, it is to be remembered that the total population of the state has increased during the last census period by 1,048,987, while that of the Japanese (accepting their figures as more reliable) has been

37,472. The Japanese increase, therefore, would be 3.6 per cent of the entire increase. The population of the state (January 1, 1920) is 3,426,536 while the Japanese population is 78,628 or 2.3 per cent.

In the light of these facts the talk of the "Hawaiianization of California" is not very impressive.

THE ALLEGED EXTRAORDINARY JAPANESE BIRTH-RATE

Governor Stephens states that "the fecundity of the Japanese race far exceeds that of any other people that we have in our midst." Senator Phelan testified before the House Committee on Immigration in September, 1919 that every Japanese "picture bride" has a child within a year after landing. Mr. McClatchy testified before the Senate Committee on Immigration September 25, 1919, that "the birth-rate among the Japanese is five times as great per thousand as among the whites," and "that picture brides usually give birth once a year, or nearly once a year to children"—and that this is one of the ways "by which Japan deliberately and carefully (sic) violates the 'Gentlemen's Agreement'!" The *Los Angeles Times* well set forth the popular belief and anxiety over the situation in its prophecy that "if the present birth-rates were maintained for the next ten years there would be 150,000 children of Japanese descent born in California in 1929 and but 40,000 white children. And in 1949 the majority of the population of California would be Japanese, ruling the state."

Mr. John S. Chambers, Controller of the state of California, in a statement issued by him October 29, 1920, as Chairman of the "Japanese Exclusion League of California" says that "the Japanese birth-rate in California is three times that of the whites, al-

though the proportion of adult females among the Japanese is less than one-third that among whites." (Just what does this statement mean? Would the Japanese birth-rate be nine times that of the whites if the number of adult females were equal?)

The Report of the State Board of Control effectually disposes of all these hysterical fables. It shows that in 1910, 313,281 white women between 15 and 45 years of age had 30,893 children, which is a fecundity rate of 9.9 per cent, while in 1919, 15,211 Japanese women had 4,378 children, which gives a rate of 28.8 per cent. This would show that the Japanese birth-rate is 2.9 times that of the whites. The report quite fairly calls attention to the fact that if Japanese and white women of the same "social, economic and intellectual status" were compared, "the disparity would undoubtedly be less marked" (p. 41). It also points out that a high birth-rate "is not infrequently true of a new people immigrating to a new land" (p. 37). Since the Board did not isolate for study the Italian, Mexican, Armenian and other peoples recently entering California in considerable numbers, it is hardly scientific for it to say that "the Japanese birth-rate is far in excess of that of all other nationalities in the state."

In the state of Massachusetts in 1910 the birth-rate of the white native stock was 14.9 per thousand while that of the foreign born of all nationalities was 49.1. The Japanese birth-rate on the basis of a population of 78,628 would be 55.6 per thousand. The birth-rate of Japanese in Japan has varied between 28.6 and 33.7 per thousand during the years 1889 to 1913.

The Board's figures, however, for the fecundity rate of white women (9.9) as quoted above is not quite fair to the Japanese, for that rate is based

on a birth record that is palpably defective. The California State Board of Health Report for 1918 (p. 192) gives the birth-rate per thousand for each year from 1906 to 1917. That rate rises from 10.3 to 17.2. The inference to be drawn from this is that the records are increasingly perfect, rather than that the rate has actually increased. In 1910 the official birth-rate was 13.4 per thousand. The actual birth-rate was doubtless higher. To compare a defective birth record for whites with an almost perfect birth record for Japanese of course makes the difference between the two more marked than it really is.

But the most convincing reply to the excited fable mongers is the Report of the State Board of Control (pp. 147-155) as to the number of "picture brides" admitted in 1918 and the number of their children. The name of each bride, of the steamer on which she arrived, of her husband and his address, and of the date of the birth of her child are all recorded. The period begins January 4, 1918 and ends February 29, 1920. The number of "brides" named is 524; the number of children born in those two years and two months is 182. That is to say, only 34.8 per cent of the brides became mothers in that period. How many American brides would become mothers in a similar length of time after marriage?

JAPANESE LAND OWNERSHIP IN CALIFORNIA

This has for years been one of the questions most heatedly debated. It has been repeatedly charged that the Japanese were buying up the best lands in the state. The Governor says that "the increase in acreage control within the last decade has been 412.9 per cent" and the value of the crops "approximately ten-fold."

The report gives statistics of land owned and leased by Japanese in each county in California and also the total acreage of irrigated land. It shows that Japanese own 74,769 acres; this is six-tenths of one per cent (.006) of the total amount of cultivated land (11,389,894 acres). "Farm lands" still "unimproved" remain to the extent of 16,541,550 acres.

Japanese lease, in addition, 383,287 acres which is 3.3 per cent of the cultivated land and 10 per cent of the irrigated land.

Attention is drawn (p. 49) to the great increase in eleven years in the value of the crops raised by Japanese. The increase is stated to be from \$6,235,856 to \$67,145,730, an increase of 976.8 per cent. This is somewhat misleading because no indication is given of the corresponding increase of the crops raised by white farmers. The Census of 1910, however, gives the total of California's crop value in 1909 as \$153,111,013, while the Board Report gives it for 1919 as \$507,811,881, an increase therefore of 331.6 per cent.

The increase in the value of the crop raised by Japanese is not correctly presented. According to the California Commissioner of Labor's special investigation and report in 1909, the total value of the crops raised on farms, where Japanese alone and Japanese and white joint labor was involved, was \$28,000,000 and the statement is made that one-half of this (\$14,000,000) was the product of Japanese labor. A more accurate statement of the increase of Japanese crop value would, therefore, be from \$14,000,000 to \$67,145,730, or 479.5 per cent, instead of the 976.8 per cent. The comparative increase in eleven years, therefore, is 331.6 per cent for the entire state and 479.5 per cent for Japanese crop values.

The statement by the Governor, that "within the last ten years Japa-

nese agricultural labor has developed to such a degree that at the present time between 80 and 90 per cent of most of our vegetable and berry products are those of Japanese farms," is not supported by the report. Figures are given (p. 103) of the percentages for the different crops. Only in the case of berries is the proportion more than 80 per cent. "Nursery products" are 58 per cent; grapes, 52 per cent and vegetables 46 per cent. Practically these same percentages were reported for the year 1909 by the California State Labor Commissioner, J. D. Mackenzie. The report offers no evidence to show that there has been any significant increase during the decade as alleged by the Governor.

FOREIGN LAND OWNERSHIP IN JAPAN

The report contains a valuable survey of the land laws of a number of states and also of Japan. While the Governor makes no reference to this question, it has played a prominent part in the public discussion. Much ignorance is displayed on the matter by men who are usually well informed on matters of which they speak.

In this brief examination of the report we can quote only the following significant sentence: "A so-called superficies title may be secured in all parts of Japan, save what may be called colonial areas, running for any number of years. Many such titles now current run for 999 years, and so far as appears they might run for 5,000 years. These titles give as complete control over the surface of the land as fee simple title would do" (p. 68).

It is surprising to find, four pages further on, the following contradiction of the above quotation. "Japanese law, like the Alien Land Law of California prohibits aliens from owning land in fee, but permits leaseholds for varying terms of years, confined to

industrial and residential purposes—no agricultural lands leased.”

This statement is erroneous. The California Land Law is discriminatory while that of Japan is not. The California law does not prohibit all “aliens” from owning land, but only a certain class of aliens—“aliens ineligible to become citizens,” namely, Japanese and Chinese. Any foreigner can take a superficies lease, practically equivalent to fee ownership, for any kind of land, including agricultural land. To say that the two laws are alike is quite aside from the truth.

THE QUESTION OF “DUAL CITIZENSHIP”

The section of the report dealing with citizenship touches upon one of the difficult problems in the relations of America and Japan. The translations of documents and the letter by Dr. Martin provide a student with material of the highest value.

The Japanese Government will no doubt consider the points raised, especially with regard to expatriation of children born in America.

The report does not adequately bring out the fact that the difficulty between America and Japan is created by American customs and laws, rather than by those of Japan. America is the only nation in the world that regards all children born within its territory as citizens by birthright. At the same time America regards children of American citizens, though born in Japan or elsewhere, nevertheless, as American citizens. The title of the section “Once a Japanese, always a Japanese” (p. 182) is not fair to Japan. There can be no question but that a frank conference between the American and Japanese governments about the difficulties due to their conflicting laws and customs is urgently needed with

a view to finding a real solution agreeable to both.

The British Embassy at Washington, replying to an inquiry by the writer, states that “children of British parents, born during their residence in America, are regarded by the British Government as British citizens. . . . Such children will not be regarded as United States citizens unless and until they have taken the usual steps by taking out papers to acquire American nationality.”

The paragraph of the report on “Future Voters” should cause both Americans and Japanese to give heed. If Japanese parents desire that their American-born children shall be American citizens they should not send them back to Japan to be reared and educated there. Such Japan-reared Japanese young people, though legally Americans, will be quite unfit to discharge their duties as American citizens.

THE JAPANESE SCHOOL QUESTION

The section of the report entitled “Schools” is disappointingly brief, less than a page and a half. There is no more important approach to the Japanese problem as it is and will continue to be through the decades, than through the school.

The problem of the Japanese language schools is apparently being allowed to drift as was the case in the Hawaiian Islands. A wise policy in regard to them is much to be desired—a policy of proper supervision and regulation.

The writer deeply regrets that the Board of Control did not read the writer’s pamphlet on the American Japanese Problem in Hawaii from which it quotes a paragraph. If it had, it would hardly have used a single sentence quite out of its connection,

which in its connection is quite correct, but wholly misleading when isolated.

JAPANESE LABOR

This report gives much valuable and interesting information on the question of Japanese labor. It appears that "there are probably more white laborers working for Oriental farmers than there are Oriental laborers working for American farmers" (p. 101). White men evidently will work for and with Japanese—an affirmation quite contrary to energetically cultivated popular opinion. Japanese, moreover, do not employ their own people exclusively. This explodes another popular opinion.

It appears that "sufficient American farm labor can be readily secured, provided comfortable housing, substantial food properly served and some opportunity for recreation is provided upon the farms" (p. 106). This is the experience of the Valley Fruit Growers' Association of Fresno, with a white membership of 3,000.

The report calls attention to the fact that since Japanese raise so large a proportion of the "food products practically indispensable to the States' daily supply," \$67,000,000 worth, "any sudden removal of the Japanese would be unwise" (p. 104). No suggestion, however, is offered as to how that "sudden removal" is to be avoided upon the enactment of the new drastic land law.

OTHER FEATURES OF THE REPORT

The report of the State Board of Control deals informingly with several other features that can not be considered in this brief examination. Japanese enterprises, for instance, secure financial aid from American banks, as does also the Japanese fishing industry. "Smuggling (of laborers) across the Mexican border is carried on success-

fully and doubtless to a large extent." This sentence is quoted from the report of the Commissioner General of Immigration. The state authorities furnish no original information on the subject.

The desire of the Board to give a fair report is well shown by the Appendix which contains two valuable monographs by Japanese. One is the *Memorial Address Presented by the Japanese Association of America to President Wilson When He Visited San Francisco September 18, 1919*. The other is an article on Japanese Farming in California by T. Chiba, Managing Director of the Agricultural Association of California. Both are well written and full of highly valuable information.

HEARINGS IN CALIFORNIA AND WASHINGTON OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The summary abstract of these Hearings shows that so far as the chairman and members were concerned effort was made to be thoroughly fair and to secure reliable information. From the nature of the case many conflicting opinions were expressed. Japanese witnesses were called in freely and also friends of the Japanese. So likewise were their bitterest critics. In California sixty-six witnesses were heard, and in Washington thirty-eight.

Senator Phelan and Mr. McClatchy testified at great length. Several witnesses had prepared carefully written statements and even extensive documents which were submitted without being read. Senator Phelan repeated his familiar charges of violation of the "Gentlemen's Agreement," of large land purchasing and of smuggling.

On a previous page a few sentences were quoted from witnesses favorable to the Japanese. These could be

largely multiplied. Many surprising statements of good will and fine relationships were made. Mr. Kanzaki stated that "the California State Commission on Immigration and Housing published pamphlets giving instruction as to American customs and manners in every language save the Japanese." Colonel Irish stated that "he had transacted several million dollars' worth of business with the Japanese and had never had one of them break his word or violate his contract." Mr. McClatchy admitted, on being questioned, that "his experience excluded any contact with prominent Japanese."

Practically none of the witnesses thought further Japanese immigration desirable. The chief difference between the pro-Japanese and the anti-Japanese seemed to be that the former desire to see absolute equality of treatment and fair play granted to those Japanese who are already here, while the latter would like to have drastic race-differential laws passed, humiliating in character and economically repressive.

Many witnesses insisted that the Americanization of Japanese is actually going on fairly well in spite of adverse circumstances. Many, on the other hand, insisted that Americanization and real assimilation is impossible without intermarriage, but that this is intolerable to think of.

Dr. Palmer, pastor of the Union Church in Hawaii, for many years a resident in California, testified as to the situation in Hawaii. "California has no idea how thoroughly Americanized the Japanese in Hawaii have become."

THE NEW ANTI-ALIEN LAND LAW

Governor Stephens says in his letter that the state "will and should, in my (his) opinion, by an overwhelming majority, enact the proposed initiative

legislation." His desire was fulfilled. It was adopted by a vote of 666,483 to 222,086. The chief surprise in this vote was the size of the opposition.

This group doubtless believes with the rest that there should not be further immigration from Japan but it does not believe in humiliating and economically repressive legislation. They wish to prevent a "new race problem" by fair play and honorable treatment and full Americanization of all Japanese who are now here.

The report of the State Board of Control contains a copy of the then proposed—now adopted stringent law. It forbids all leasing of agricultural land to "aliens ineligible to become citizens of the United States." Such aliens may not form corporations entitled to purchase or lease such land, nor may they buy shares or stock in corporations entitled to acquire or own such land. The guardians of children whose parents are Japanese or Chinese, in whose name agricultural land is owned or bought, are to be appointed by the courts.

A COMING DISAPPOINTMENT TO CALIFORNIA

Governor Stephens implies, and practically all the anti-Japanese agitators affirm, that if a rigid law is passed forbidding further Japanese immigration, the Japanese population in California will dwindle away, as the Chinese has, and finally disappear as a problem. This is what California has been led to expect.

This expectation is practically certain to be unrealized. The Japanese situation today is wholly different from that of the Chinese in 1882 when their immigration was stopped. Few Chinese women entered the United States either before that date or since. The annual births of Chinese in California for ten years has averaged only 374.

The Chinese population in California December 31, 1919 is estimated by the Board as 33,271—the decrease in ten years having been 2,977.

The average Japanese laborer in California, unlike the Chinese but like the European, is eager to establish his home here. This is the reason why so many Japanese women have been coming to America. Japanese labor immigration was stopped in 1907. But the men then here have established families to the extent of about 15,000. There still remain between 20,000 and 25,000 unmarried men. The recent decision of the Japanese Government to stop granting passports to young women coming to join husbands in America, whom though legally married they had not met in Japan, will retard somewhat the increase of Japanese families in California, but is not likely to stop it. Prosperous Japanese men can return to Japan for a visit, get married and return with their wives. In case that is stopped it would seem altogether probable that they would go to Hawaii and find American-born wives.

But however that may be, the number of Japanese families in California is already large enough to insure a permanent and a growing Japanese population. The births recorded for the three years 1917, 1918 and 1919 respectively were 4,108, 4,365 and 4,378.

The enactment by Congress of a drastic Japanese exclusion law is to be expected in the near future. It will be obnoxious and humiliating to Japan because of her consciousness of having faithfully administered the "Gentlemen's Agreement" during the past twelve years. Its results will be disappointing to California because it will not make any marked diminution in the number of Japanese in California. On the contrary that population is certain to grow.

Misrepresentations as to the past and false expectations as to the future are likely to be taken advantage of by unscrupulous politicians to start renewed agitation a few years hence by which again to gain personal and party advantage.

APPENDIX

THE UNITED STATES CENSUS 1900, 1910 AND 1920

The Bureau of the Census issued November 16, 1920 a preliminary announcement of a few figures in regard to the Japanese population in the states of California, Oregon and Washington and in the territory of Hawaii. We give these figures in tabular form and call attention to some of the surprising facts disclosed.

1. The total population of California increased from 1,485,653 in 1900 to 2,377,549 in 1910 and to 3,426,861 in 1920. At those same dates, the Japanese population numbered respectively 10,151, 41,358 and 70,196. Stated in percentages the Japanese population constituted 0.7 per cent, 1.7 per cent and 2 per cent of the total population in 1900, 1910 and 1920 respectively. The point to be noted is the large increase of the general population.

2. In Hawaii, the Japanese population constituted 39.7 per cent of the total population in 1900; 41.5 per cent in 1910, and 42.7 per cent in 1920, the figures being 61,111, 79,675 and 109,269 respectively. In other words, the relative increase of the Japanese population has been very small indeed.

3. The Japanese population in California showed an increase of 307.4 per cent between 1900 and 1910, immigration having been free until 1908; while during the decade between 1910 and 1920 the increase was 69.7 per cent, consisting chiefly of women and children.

4. The proportion of Japanese males to females in California in 1900 was 94.6; in 1910 it was 84.9 per cent and in 1920 it was 63.2 per cent. In Hawaii the proportion of males to females at the three dates was respectively 77.7 per cent, 68.8 per cent and 57.3 per cent.

	CALIFORNIA		OREGON		WASHINGTON		HAWAII	
	<i>Figures</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>	<i>Figures</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>	<i>Figures</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>	<i>Figures</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>
<i>Census 1920</i>								
Total Population of State.....	3,426,861	98.	783,389	99.5	1,356,621	98.7	255,912	57.3
Japanese Population	70,196	2.	4,022	0.5	17,114	1.3	109,269	42.7
Males	44,364	63.2	2,722	67.7	11,173	65.3	62,643	57.3
Females	25,832	36.8	1,300	23.3	5,941	34.7	46,626	42.7
<i>Census 1910</i>								
Total Population.....	2,377,549	98.3	672,765	99.5	1,141,990	98.9	191,909	58.5
Japanese Population	41,358	1.7	3,418	0.5	12,929	1.1	79,675	41.5
Males	35,116	84.9	3,124	91.4	11,241	86.9	54,784	68.8
Females	6,240	15.1	294	8.6	1,688	13.1	24,891	31.2
<i>Census 1900</i>								
Total Population.....	1,485,053	99.3	413,536	99.4	518,103	98.9	154,001	60.3
Japanese Population	10,151	0.7	2,501	0.6	5,617	1.1	61,111	39.7
Males	9,598	94.6	2,405	96.2	5,432	96.7	47,508	77.7
Females	553	5.4	96	3.8	183	3.3	13,603	22.3
<i>Increase of Japanese Population</i>								
1910-1920.....	28,840	69.7	604	17.7	4,185	32.4	29,594	37.1
1900-1910.....	31,205	307.4	917	36.7	7,312	130.2	18,564	30.4

Racial Prejudice Un-American

By REV. M. A. MATTHEWS, D.D., LL.D.

Pastor, First Presbyterian Church, Seattle, Washington

THE problem presented by the California agitation against the Japanese is not one of righting the wrong done the Japanese but the one of protecting the honor and name of America. Therefore, this discussion is not pro-Japanese but extremely pro-American. Consider the following facts:

1. Japan has not broken faith nor

treaty with America since Admiral Perry first established friendly relationship between America and Japan. Can we afford to be the first to break?

2. Japan has not broken the faith of the "Gentlemen's Agreement" established by our revered Theodore Roosevelt. Can we be the first to abrogate it?